

## Carolyn Clevenger - Supplemental Challenge Letter to ABAG staff response

---

**From:** Judy Schriebman  
**To:** <CClevenger@mtc.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/17/2013 7:53 PM  
**Subject:** Supplemental Challenge Letter to ABAG staff response  
**CC:** <eircomments@mtc.ca.gov>

---

Dear Ms. Clevenger:

The answer I received by staff in regard to my comments was unacceptable, inadequate to the many points I raised and shows a clear bias that is not supported by any evidence, failing the test of a good answer. It did not address my concerns regarding the incorrect assumptions made, such as the hypothetical job growth figures, or that this plan did not attain its goal of reducing greenhouse gasses even by its own criteria.

My comment on extending the comment period was based on the fact that the documentation was very massive, and that we, the community, are not paid planners nor do we all have limitless free time. Public engagement was limited and outreach to our neighborhood was absent. I am sure that staff followed the letter of the law with regard to notice; however, they did NOT follow the law as laid out in SB 375 which calls for outreach to neighborhoods and HOA's ahead of time. To call someone in at the last minute with a staged show and then feed them packaged answers without incorporating their comments is the height of out-of-touch planning.

This arrogance is borne out by staff's comments below:

"Note that the proposed Plan would result in only around 500 additional households in Marin County by 2040 compared to the growth expected under the No Project alternative; see Chapter 3.1 of the Draft EIR."

To say that "only around 500 additional households" is to ignore any reasonable standard of analysis. 500 additional households might be easily absorbed by some areas, for example, Siskiyou County, and could be an incredible added burden to others, like Marin. This argument completely ignores the fact that both city and County are putting 78% and 50%, respectively, of their high density affordable housing *in one area code* of marin county. **City and county cumulative effects** are NOT taken into account by ABAG, **a clear CEQA violation**. Housing numbers are also ignoring Marin's limited water resources and the impacts of SLR on land already built upon, which will have to be protected at great cost or abandoned. The numbers also ignore the lack of job growth in our county. If the goal is to put people closer to their jobs, then putting them all near 101 adds in expecting them to commute, because the jobs are not there. And more commuting will mean more cars.

In addition, it did not address my point about lack of transportation between Marin and the East Bay. This is a forced housing document, not a sustainability plan, not a greenhouse gas reduction plan and not a transportation plan. The only One it benefits is high density developers.

Plan Bay Area should be rejected as failing in its objectives, failing in public process and failing in transparency and good government. I am appalled that it has gotten this far. The more I learn and the more people find out about it, the greater their objections.

I request that this plan be rejected and that the No Plan Alternative be accepted. The money wasted on the consultants should be refunded. A plan that doesn't meet its own objectives is a failed plan.

Sincerely,

Judy Schriebman

My letter:

I respectfully request more time and an official extension of 6 months. There are numerous inadequacies, oversights, incorrect assumptions and lack of true public engagement in the plan. It doesn't even meet its goal of reducing greenhouse gases. While I applaud its goals of increasing affordable housing and transportation alternatives and reducing sprawl, I believe you have it backwards.

Reliable, good public transportation that easily gets people to their destination is needed first. Right now, and still in the plan, there is NO good way to get to the East Bay from Marin and vice versa. The one bus per hour that leaves Richmond BART occasionally leave ahead of schedule, stranding passengers who expect it to be there. The lack of integrated bus passes, getting better w/the Clipper card but still woefully inadequate, HAS to be addressed. The buses HAVE to go to more places where people want to go. I cannot get to Steinhart Aquarium or Golden Gate Park in any convenient fashion from Marin. This integration needs to be developed first, before loading up housing near the SMART train station which will serve only a very small proportion of just commuters.

The lack of transparency and inability for public comment and legitimate questions to actually be incorporated in this plan makes it a farce. This is a done deal, and that is what people are reacting to. There has been no real outreach, with the goal of addresses concerns. This plan is a first draft. Treat it as such, bring it back with good changes, and the scenery could shift.

Marin is also rural/suburban, and any housing numbers should be based on that designation.